

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-2, 4-10, and 12-14 have been canceled. Claims 3 and 11 have been amended and are pending, and claims 15-18 have been newly added.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 10, 11, and 14 as anticipated by Apostolopoulos (US Patent Publication 2002/0116715). Claims 1-2, 4-7, 10, and 14 have been canceled, and the rejection as to those claims therefore is moot.

Claim 3 has been amended, and Apostolopoulos does not teach or disclose all of the limitations in amended claim 3. For example, Apostolopoulos does not teach or disclose “reconstructing a frame of even scanning lines using a corresponding frame of odd scanning lines and a previous frame comprising even scanning lines.” Therefore, amended claim 3 is not anticipated by Apostolopoulos. It should be noted that De Haan (which the Examiner used in Section 103 rejections, discussed below) also does not teach or disclose this limitation, and amended claim 3 therefore is not rendered obvious by these references.

Similarly, claim 11 has been amended, and Apostolopoulos does not teach or disclose all of the limitations in amended claim 11. For example, Apostolopoulos does not teach or disclose a “means for reconstructing a frame of even scanning lines using a corresponding frame of odd scanning lines and a previous frame comprising even scanning lines.” Therefore, amended claim 11 is not anticipated by Apostolopoulos. It should be noted that De Haan also does not teach or disclose this limitation, and amended claim 11 therefore is not rendered obvious by these references.

Newly added claim 15 is similar to claim 3, except that it refers to the reconstruction of a frame of odd scanning lines instead of a frame of even scanning lines. It is patentable for the same reasons discussed above for claim 3.

Newly added claims 16-18 are dependent upon claims 3, 11, and 15, respectively, and are patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above for those claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 8-9 and 12-13 as unpatentable over Apostolopoulos in view of De Haan (US Patent 6,618,094). Claims 8-9 and 12-13 have been canceled, and the rejection as to those claims therefore is moot.

The Applicants respectfully submit that claims 3, 11, and 15-18 are in allowable form. Early and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
DLA PIPER US LLP

Dated: December 15, 2011 By: /Brent K. Yamashita/
Brent K. Yamashita
Reg. No. 53,808

Attorneys for Applicant(s)

Brent K. Yamashita
DLA Piper LLP (US)
2000 University Avenue
East Palo Alto, CA 94303-2248
650-833-2348 (Direct)
650-833-2000 (Main)
650-687-1206 (Facsimile)
brent.yamashita @dlapiper.com